

Examining Constitutional Offices

Phase 1 Process Analysis Final Report

Study Partners



With assistance from:

- The Compensation Board
- The Department of Planning and Budget
- Virginia Information Technologies Agency
- Interested Stakeholders

Scope of Study

- Review of past efforts of reform:
 - Examination of prior JLARC reports;
 - Review of previous DPB and Executive efforts; and
 - Examination of documents and letters produced by stakeholders.
- Process analysis of Compensation Board process:
 - Examination of Compensation Board process; and
 - Identification of any unintended consequences.

Scope of Study Cont.

- Review of service delivery:
 - Identify overlap with local services; and
 - Identify overlap with state services.
- Identification of avenues of reform:
 - Review of all offices; and
 - Creation of decision matrixes where potential efficiencies are identified.

Compensation Board Process

Findings of Note:

- The funding process is overly complex and involves multiple state entities; and
- The funding process has the potential to create unintended consequences in the form of incentivizing certain behaviors and decision-making.

Compensation Board Process Cont.

Decision Matrix for Complexity of Funding Process

Decision:	Type of Change:
Request JLARC to study and recommend a more streamlined approach to determining the funding levels of Constitutional Officers.	Legislative
Direct the Compensation Board to indentify and employ a more streamlined approach to determining the funding levels of Constitutional Officers.	Executive & Legislative
Make no change.	None



Compensation Board Process Cont.

Decision Matrix for Unintended Consequences

Decision:	Type of Change:
Request JLARC to study and recommend an approach to defining the funding levels of Constitutional Officers that takes into account the individual localities' unique nature.	Legislative
Direct the Compensation Board to indentify and employ an approach to set the funding levels of Constitutional Officers that takes into account the individual localities' unique nature.	Executive & Legislative
Make no change.	None

Review of Service Delivery

Findings of Note:

- There is potential for increased efficiency by eliminating duplication of duties by either other local officials or agencies of the Commonwealth; and
- Offering greater flexibility in defining duties has the potential to create both efficiencies and real dollar savings;

Review of Service Delivery Cont.

Examples of Identified Areas of Duplication

Commissioner of Revenue		Treasurer		Clerk of the Court	
Task	Other Party	Task	Other Party	Task	Other Party
Audits	State	Billing	Local	Collections	State
DMV Services	State	Revenue Forecasting	Local		
Assessment	Local	Collections	Local/State		
State Income Taxes	State				
State Tax Assessment	State				



Review of Service Delivery Cont.

Decision Matrix for Duplication of Duties

Decision:	Type of Change:
Assign duplicative duties to appropriate entity.	Legislative
Allow for local discretion on eliminating duplication of duties.	Legislative & Local
Establish a system to remove a set percentage of duplication by a set date.	Executive, Legislative & Local
Make no change.	None

Review of Service Delivery Cont.

Decision Matrix for Local Flexibility in Assigning Duties

Decision:	Type of Change:
Enact legislation enabling either the Board of Supervisors or the City Council to assign through MOUs with the appropriate parties certain duties currently performed by Constitutional Officers.	Legislative
Make no change.	None

Review of Service Delivery Cont.

Decision Matrix for Outsourcing or Privatization

Decision:	Type of Change:
Enact legislation that allows localities to pursue, subject to legislative/constitutional constraints and MOUs with appropriate Commonwealth or local elected bodies, various individually-designed types of outsourcing or privatization of specific functions.	Legislative / Executive
Make no change.	None

Questions and Comments?



MERCATUS CENTER
George Mason University

